	n the ERNA	NOIT	AL PRELIMINARY EXA	MINING AUTHORITY	RECE	IVE	ED	1 to		
To Mc RE	:Knigł	nt, Jo	hn C. NCKISER PLC	(-)	RECKITIB	ENC	PCT CKISER	'		
Gr		aten	ts Department		GROUP PATE WRITTEN OPINION					
Hu	II HU	8 7DS			(PCT Rule 66)					
							2 50	i1 04		
					Date of mailing (day/month/year)		02.04.2	004		
	olicant's 057P1	_	ent's file reference		REPLY DUE within 3 month(s) from the above date of mailing					
1	mation T/GB		lication No. 2796	International filing date (30.06.2003	nternational filing date <i>(day/month/year)</i> 0.06.2003			Priority date (day/month/year) 28.06.2002		
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C08L91/08										
1	licant		NO1410ED (1110 1 11 417			i lo	: 30	1		
HE	CKII	IBF	NCKISER (UK) LIMIT	ED et al	· .	10		<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>		
		•			1)	10	C100074	14/04 1	412/4	
1.	1. This written opinion is the first drawn up by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.									
2.	This	opini	on contains indications	relating to the following	items:	i	11057	bi Mg		
	1	⊠	Basis of the opinion			DIA	ARY	1	1	
	## ###		Priority	opinion with regard to r	and the factor of the	DE	00000175.714	rlicability K	-}	
	IV		Look of unity of invent	ion		_		WALLEY TO		
	V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi citations and explanations supporting such sta				rith regard to nove atement	h regard to nove tv. inventive step or industrial applicability; ACKNOW				
	VI Certain documents cited									
	VII VIII			international application		REN	VEWALS		i	
3.	and the state of t									
J 5.	The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion. When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension are Rule 86 8(d).						•.			
	How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where For the form and the language of the amendments				appropriate, by ame	endme 1 66.9.	ents, according to F	Rule 66.3.		
	Also: For an additional opportunity to submit amendment For the examiner's obligation to consider amendment For an informal communication with the examiner			inity to submit amendment	nts, see Rule 66.4. ents and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 his					
	If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.									
4.	The	The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 28.10.2004								
			address of the internation	al	Authorized Officer		, a			



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Lanz, S

ائيلي، - -

Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits)
Hardy Magliano, N
Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8151



I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed"):

	De	Description, Pages								
	1-1	11	as originally filed							
	Cla	Claims, Numbers								
	1-1	4	as originally filed							
2.	Wit lan	With regard to the language , all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.								
	These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:									
		anslation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)). lication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)). anslation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under 3).								
3.	Wit inte	With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:								
		contained in the inte	rnational application in written form.							
	☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.									
	☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.									
		☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.								
		The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosin the international application as filed has been furnished.								
		The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.								
4.	The	amendments have re	esulted in the cancellation of:							
		the description,	pages:							
		the claims,	Nos.:							
		the drawings,	sheets:							
5.		This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).								
6.	Add	ditional observations, if necessary:								

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial

applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Novelty (N)

Claims

1,5,6,13,14

Inventive step (IS)

Claims

7-12

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



Re Item V

Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Reference is made to the following document:

D1: US-A-4 002 706 (PRETORIUS DIRK JACOBUS) 11 January 1977 (1977-01-11)

Example 2 of document D1 discloses a paraffin wax composition having a 2. penetration value of 41 (10⁻¹ mm, 25°C) comprising a hard wax having a penetration value of less than 2 and a soft wax having a penetration value of greater than 200. Example 5 discloses a paraffin wax composition having a penetration value of 37 comprising a hard wax having a penetration value of less than 2 and a soft wax having a penetration value of 98.

Therefore document D1 destroys novelty of subject-matter of claims 1,5,6,13,14 of the present application. The subject-matter of claims 7-12 deems not to involve an inventive step.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY